

REMARKS

Claims 10 and 11 are canceled herein.

Claim 8 is amended to reflect the moieties indicated at page 4, lines 12-15 of the specification.


The rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention is respectfully traversed and submitted to be in error for the following reasons:

The inventors were co-authors of the Davis et al paper referenced at page 2 of the specification. It is readily apparent that the inventors did have possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

The rejection is submitted to be now moot in light of cancellation of claims 10 and 11.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the the claims under consideration are submitted to distinguish over the art of record and, as such, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are thus respectfully requested at this time.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles E. Bricker, Reg. No. 26,715
Attorney for Applicants

(937)-255-5052
charles.bricker@wpafb.af.mil